

friends and their district that might not be able to withstand scrutiny. I am very disappointed we do not have tax cuts in this bill.

I cannot believe that we cannot even get an effective limitation on taxpayers' dollars being used to fund referendums overseas to overturn laws that are protecting innocent children from being aborted. American tax dollars are being used to fund pro-abortion referendums around this world. We have it tied to funding for the U.N. and for State Department reauthorization, but that to me seems like a no-brainer. But as long as we have the President we currently have in the White House, that becomes a very difficult victory.

So I am not going to stand up here and say I like everything in this bill, but there are some things that in fact are important changes, and that is the art of compromise, and the President did give some ground, the Democrats in the House and Senate gave some ground, and we had to give some ground.

In the education area in fact we made a lot of progress. The President will stand up and say he got 100,000 teachers or 40,000 teachers or whatever, but the fact is it moved back to the state level. We gave flexibility, and as the chairman of the Education Committee, Mr. GOODLING, keeps pointing out, that in fact is what we were driving towards. We also have a ban on national testing so kids around this country are not slammed in under one major test.

We have level funding on the National Endowment for the Arts, number of other things they worked with in the Education Committee.

In addition to that, there are many of us who are very concerned that we have not developed an adequate missile defense in this country, and since we knew we were going to spend more on domestic issues, we wanted to make sure that the preparedness and the readiness of our Armed Forces, that the development of our missile defense systems, were going to be funded as well as the social spending.

I am very concerned in this country about the expansion of pornography along with the expansion of Internet. We all know that whenever we have an expansion of technology, whether it be television, or whether it be computers, that that opens up things to our children and our families that we hoped would be, they could be protected from. Yet these advantages of technology have been wonderful for our country, but we need to the best we can, limit the pornography and the perversion from getting into our homes and making sure that minors do not have access to that. That was one of the last points negotiated in this bill. It is something that Dr. James Dobson in Focus on the Family has battled for for a decade, working on the Pornography Commission. We finally have a victory in the area of Internet porn.

We have a number of extensions on tax extenders for self-employed busi-

nesses and for farmers that were very critical to many small businesses in my district and throughout the country. We have a whole range of what would be termed more minor issues relating to gun registries, relating to language on certain bills where in fact conservatives won, and that is how this process works.

One last comment:

Anybody who says that they are going to put aside money for Social Security, this is one more proof the only thing that government can do is either spend it or give it back to you. We have once again seen the fraud of using senior citizens as a shield to cover real motives. In fact, we are spending 19 to 20 billion extra dollars, much of that will be in the baseline and be spent for future years, too. We have basically spent a big chunk, if not the majority, of the so-called surplus, and it did not go to seniors. That started when the President came up here with the State of the Union address, said I want everything put to Social Security, and then detailed for 20 pages new programs to spend that. Today we are seeing that come through. I am disappointed in that, but in the end this is a bill worth moving.

THE OMNIBUS SCORECARD—WINS AND LOSSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSION. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise with my colleagues. We have been at work in Washington now for an extra week. Many of us did not go home as we normally do. I have gone home every weekend for the last 2 years. But it was important for us to be here. It was important for us to be here because we are working on the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, just several weeks ago I addressed schools all over the Fifth District of Texas during a very important time, the 211th birthday of the Constitution of the United States, and at the time I addressed these students I talked about that our country was engaged in an experiment. The experiment is that of constitutional government. And this experiment will only last as long as people have faith and confidence not only in the Congress and the constitutional guarantees which are contained in the Constitution, but also in the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working this week extra, what I would call overtime away from our families, away from our districts because we deeply believe in what we are doing. We, too, are engaged in an experiment.

Tonight I would like to speak for just a few minutes about the importance of this extra week, the importance of doing work that is important for people who are not here in Washington but are back home. Some of those people are people who live in the country.

Some of those people are people who are God-fearing people who care deeply about what we do here. The work that we have done, we need to let them know what that is, and I would like to spend just a few minutes in enumerating some of those better qualities of what this experiment is all about.

What we are going to do is to pass an omnibus bill tomorrow when we have an opportunity to vote on it, and what it is going to do is it is going to bring about tax relief for financially strapped farmers and ranchers, and what we are going to include is income averaging and also an AMT deferment. We are also going to have tax relief for farmers and self-employed people in vigils, and what we are going to do is to bring back in time from the year 2007 to the year 2003 whereby self-employed people will be able to deduct 100 percent of their insurance premiums.

You have heard earlier this evening us talk about the plan for education. I will tell you as a parent of a 4½-year-old Down's syndrome little boy, Alexander Sessions, I am pleased and proud of what my Republican colleagues and the deal that they have cut with the President of the United States because I knew when I came here that Washington, Washington required school districts to give education and opportunities in the classroom for Down's Syndrome and other disabled children, but Washington did not fund that, and it made it very difficult for school districts to comply. I am proud to say that now Washington is going to give these school districts the opportunity to fund these programs. It makes a difference for my family and myself. It makes a difference for hundreds of thousands of other parents who have loving children who need the opportunity to be in those mainstream educational systems and to have teachers who do not go back and forth but are dedicated directly to them.

I am proud of that also. I am also proud of one part of this bill which I brought to Congress as a promise to the people of the Fifth District of Texas, that I would attempt to pass, and that is a bill that became known as the Speed Trafficking Life Imprisonment Act of 1998. It used to be the Speed Trafficking Life Imprisonment Act of 1997. It could not be done last year but it fit this year, and here is what it does. It says very plainly that those people, those drug thugs, that are involved in the manufacture and distribution of methamphetamines will now face the same penalties as those who are involved in manufacturing and distributing crack cocaine and heroin.

It is about time where we in this country recognize that the children of this country need to be protected. It is time for drug thugs to spend their time behind bars. I will vote aye.

RELIEF FOR AMERICAN FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the most beautiful agriculture districts in the country, the Eastern District of the State of Washington, the east one-fourth of our state, the largest geographic district in the State of Washington. We have abundant wheat farming. Peas and lentils are grown there, potatoes and other agriculture commodities. So agriculture is a very important component of this budget agreement legislation that has been agreed upon by the leaders of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, and by the White House. It has specific interest to me coming from an agriculture-producing area.

Washington farmers export about 90 percent of our commodities that are produced each year, and we have had a great crop this year. We had a great crop last year. Hopefully, we will have great crops in the future.

The genesis for the freedom to farm, the Federal Agriculture Improvement Act, which was signed into law by the President and passed in a bipartisan way in 1996, was right in the Fifth District of Washington.

When I first got elected to Congress in 1994, started serving in 1995, I approached agriculture producers and farmers in the Fifth District of Washington and said what do we need in the way of farm improvements, agriculture improvements, policy improvements? They came up with a lot of that which was eventually signed into law as the freedom to farm concept and the freedom to farm legislation, that allowed farmers across this country to have a transition out of the old system into the new, the freedom to market system whereby our farmers would market our products around the world with several understandings.

Number one, that there would be some tax relief; that there would be some sanctions relief; that we would not be imposing sanctions which inhibited the export of our commodities overseas; regulatory relief and certainly agriculture research.

So it was with these issues in mind that I have approached whether to support this legislation that has now been crafted or not, and I am proud to say that as a person from a farm community and a farm region, that this is a good bill.

It provides about \$6 billion in additional relief, in disaster payments and in market shortage sanctions payments, essentially, because of the reduction in demand from our Far Eastern trading partners; frankly, I think not as aggressive an approach to agriculture marketing as our USDA ought to have. I think our USDA, our government, ought to be out there pushing our products worldwide and helping our farmers in this transition period, this 7-year period of getting some payments so that they can farm for the market, not for the government.

So I am pleased that this particular legislation, even though the President vetoed the ag appropriations bill, and I happen to serve proudly on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, and we thought that was a good bill, had good research dollars in it, it had additional transition payments under the existing system that would help farmers, but it was vetoed, unfortunately I felt, because we wanted and knew in this negotiation that we would be adding additional disaster payments and sanctions relief for our farmers.

Nevertheless, the product that has been produced out of these negotiations is a good one. It provides a total of \$5.939 billion in additional spending, total spending, I should say, under the ag appropriations bill for market loss payments for 1998 disaster payments, for multiyear disaster payments, for livestock fee payments for a Farm Service Agency loan authority and for Farm Service Agency administration.

Our farmers are now inundating these farm service agencies with assistance requests and these people are needing help. We provide that help in this bill. We did it in the ag appropriations bill but it is reinforced in the final budget negotiation bill that has been approved and will be approved, I should say, in this House and has been approved by our leadership.

The tax relief that is provided in this bill is good for farmers. It will be talked about by my good friend and my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) here shortly, but it is a good bill. It is a good tax relief package.

It is not what we want totally, because I am one that favors greater tax relief for farmers and all Americans. I think we were not able to get that in this negotiation but we will get it next year. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, support the relief that is provided by this legislation for farmers.

RELIEF, NOT MORE TAXES, FOR FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker very much for this time and I also thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for his comments about the agricultural provisions in this bill that we are about to pass tomorrow.

I would just like to point out some key provisions I think that are extremely important to all of us in agriculture who are experiencing some very difficult times. First of all, a new provision as far as soy biodiesel, and the gentleman in the Chair, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), has played a major role in getting this included, this is going to be a great op-

portunity for soybean producers to use soybean oil as a fuel. It will add value to soybeans to the tune of about 8 to 14 cents a bushel. If someone is an Iowa farmer, that is a lot of money.

Also a provision in here gives some additional help to livestock producers who have experienced devastating crop loss and have had to go out and buy feed for their livestock. There are \$200 million in there for those disasters.

I think this bill finally shows a stark contrast to what the administration in their budget proposal put forth when they had \$573 million of taxes on farmers in the form of user fees if they are in the livestock business. So this is a great victory for livestock producers.

There is a provision in here which is very important also to livestock producers, and that is a 1-year price reporting provision and a study to go with that. It is a pilot program, but I think it is very, very important that there is transparency in the market place so that people know when they discover price for livestock it is done in an open and fair manner and this is a very, very important provision.

Also, for farmers, there are some tax provisions that are extraordinarily important. Income averaging, 3-year income averaging, is going to become a permanent part of our tax law after this bill is passed. We have a look-back provision so that if a farmer had a very good year 4 years back he can look back this year if he had a disaster and recover some of the taxes that he paid back in his very, very high income year, extremely important; a 5-year look back provision.

Health care deduction for not only farmers but for all self-employed people, this is extraordinarily important. If a person is a farmer out there, if they have a small business, one of their major costs is health care, and currently we are not allowed to deduct nearly enough of the cost of that health care. In the year 2003, it will go to 100 percent deductibility, extremely important for self-employed folks and for farmers.

Because of our good friends at the IRS, we had to include a provision so that they did not tax us this year on money that we did not receive this year. As farmers know, the emergency bill we passed earlier allowed them to take their farm payments earlier in this year for the entire 1999 year. Well, IRS said because a person may or may not take the money actually this year, if they do not take it we are still going to charge tax on it. So we fixed that provision in this bill.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think with this aid package that is here for agriculture, we did not undermine the fundamental policy of the freedom to farm bill. The freedom to farm is based on the idea of the government finally respecting the intelligence of farmers to make decisions for themselves.

Over the last 6 years we have had a one-size-fits-all government controlled